

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 399

TM 012 965

AUTHOR Sweitzer, H. Frederick; Weinstein, Gerald  
TITLE The ERT2: An Instrument and Scoring System for  
Assessing Maximum Stage Capacity in Self-Knowledge  
Development.  
PUB DATE 85  
NOTE 18p.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) --  
Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)  
  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Classification; \*Developmental Stages; Group Testing;  
\*Individual Development; \*Recall (Psychology);  
\*Scoring; Self Concept; \*Self Concept Measures; Test  
Reliability  
IDENTIFIERS \*Experience Recall Test 2; \*Self Knowledge  
Development Theory; Test Instructions

## ABSTRACT

Self-Knowledge Development Theory (SKDT) by Weinstein and A. Alschuler (1985) is a structural developmental theory positing four stages in the development of self-knowledge. The Experience Recall Test-2 (ERT2) is described, which is the most recent instrument developed for assessing the SKDT. Self-knowledge is defined as the ability to describe internal experiences as fully as possible, to anticipate internal responses as precisely as possible, and to manage that experience as intentionally and effectively as possible. Four invariant, hierarchical stages are present in the growth of these abilities: (1) elemental; (2) situational; (3) pattern; and (4) transformational. The theory is pertinent to theoreticians and researchers interested in human development and to practitioners interested in promoting the growth of these abilities. It assists practitioners in understanding and differentiating clients, setting manageable goals, and selecting and sequencing interventions. The ERT2, which can be administered in groups, is designed to elicit the highest level of self-knowledge of which an individual is capable. The instrument includes a memory scan, a description of a significant event, and questions about that event. Further study of the ERT2 and its coding manual is needed to establish reliability. The ERT2 and associated instructions are appended. (TJH)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED305399

**The ERT2: An Instrument and Scoring System for  
Assessing Maximum Stage Capacity in Self-Knowledge Development.**

H. Frederick Sweitzer, Ed.D.  
College of Education, Nursing and Health Professions  
University of Hartford  
West Hartford, CT.

Gerald Weinstein  
School of Education  
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. FREDERICK SWEITZER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM012965

### Abstract

Self-Knowledge Development Theory is a structural developmental theory, positing four stages in the development of self knowledge. The ERT, the original instrument for assessing stage levels in this theory, was designed to measure subjects' spontaneous level of self knowledge. This article describes the development of the ERT2, a group administrable instrument designed to elicit the highest level of self knowledge of which an individual is capable. Preliminary data on intercoder reliability are discussed.

## Introduction

For the past fifteen years, a growing number of theories have explored the existence of structural stages in a variety of domains of human development. This approach to understanding development is modeled on the work of Piaget (1968, 1971) and has been called cognitive developmental theory (Kohlberg, 1969), constructive developmental theory (Kegan, 1982) and structural developmental theory (Sweitzer, 1984). This group of stage theories includes Kohlberg's theory of moral development (1981), Selman's work on the development of interpersonal understanding (1980), Kegan's theory of ego development (1982) and Weinstein and Alschuler's self-knowledge development theory (1985). For each of these theories, at least one assessment instrument has been developed. These instruments vary in form and scoring method, but all of them attempt to elicit responses from subjects, assign scores to these responses and use these scores to assign subjects a stage or level of development along a particular continuum. This article describes the ERT2, the most recent instrument developed for assessing Weinstein and Alschuler's Self-Knowledge Development Theory (hereafter referred to as SKT).

Both SKT and the instruments used to measure it were developed with the practitioner as well as the theoretician in mind. Self-knowledge is defined by Weinstein and Alschuler as the ability to describe internal experiences as fully as possible, to anticipate internal responses as precisely as possible and to manage that experience as intentionally and effectively as possible (1985, p. 19). They describe four invariant, hierarchical stages in the growth of these abilities. Knowledge of this theory is useful to theoreticians and researchers interested in this domain of human development and to practitioners interested in promoting the growth of these abilities. It assists practitioners in understanding and differentiating clients, setting manageable goals (both short and long term) and selecting and sequencing interventions.

The instrument designed to measure stages of SKT has been called the Experience Recall Test or ERT (Tamashiro, 1976) and the Unforgettable Experience Recall or UER (Weinstein and Alschuler, 1985). It was designed to be a group administrable instrument, usable by researchers and practitioners after a brief training period. However, both the ERT and its scoring system were designed to measure a person's spontaneous response and stage of self-knowledge. While an effective instrument for this purpose, it does not measure the subject's maximum stage capacity. The ERT2 was developed to fill that gap. It is not

meant to replace the ERT, but to give researchers and practitioners a choice of instruments to suit a variety of situations.

### Other Measures of Structural Development

Piaget pioneered the structural approach to assessment called the clinical method (Piaget, 1968; Bringuier, 1980). Subjects are examined individually; they are given a task to perform and interviewed about their response to the task. The examiner interacts with the subject throughout the interview. Although some of the examiner's questions are standard, many of them are dictated by the subject's response, so that each interview is somewhat unique. The examiner probes the subject until s/he is satisfied that s/he has uncovered the reasoning behind the subject's initial response.

This method, with some variations, has been used by other investigators of human development, particularly those using a structural approach (Kohlberg, 1976; Broughton, 1978; Selman, 1980; Kegan, 1985). Its principal advantage over standardized, group administrable instruments is that it allows the examiner to ask as few or as many questions as necessary to uncover the structure of the underlying reasoning. It also has several disadvantages. Since the instruments can be given to only one subject at a time, they can be quite time consuming. Also, using them requires a good deal of training; learning how to select probe questions and how to score can take from two weeks to two years (Kohlberg, 1976; Brainerd, 1978). This requires a large investment of time for practitioners. It has also been argued that since the training is often available only from those who developed the theories, independent research is difficult (Colby, Gibbs and Widaman, 1982). Finally, the uniqueness of each interview procedure creates problems with standardization. In recent years, attempts have been made to develop group administrable equivalents to some of these instruments (Rest, 1975; Colby, Gibbs and Widaman, 1982).

Scoring methods for these instruments vary. All of them break the subject's response down into smaller scorable units, which are assigned a score to represent the stage of reasoning exhibited. From there, the most common approach is to compute a global or average score based on a mathematical formula applied to all the smaller unit scores. Kegan

(1985) appears to be an exception; the subject is assigned the highest stage for which three clear examples are found.

### Measurement of Self-Knowledge

There are four stages of development in SKT: elemental, situational, pattern and transformational. A thorough description of them can be found in Weinstein and Alschuler's 1985 article, but a brief description will be given here to provide a context for the ensuing discussion of measurement. In the elemental stage, descriptions of internal experience are limited to physical and sensory details and events are often reported in a disjointed way. The situational stage marks the beginning of reporting of feelings and thoughts, of the ability to report cause and effect, and of the ability to refer to situations as whole ("It was the first time I'd dated an older woman.") In the pattern stage, subjects are able to identify consistent internal responses to certain classes of situations ("Whenever I meet a group of new people I become nervous and begin to doubt myself.") Finally, in the transformational stage, subjects report the ability to take internal action to modify these patterns.

The Experience Recall Test (ERT) was the first instrument developed to assess self-knowledge. It was originally used to collect data from which the stages were derived (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1975; Weinstein and Alschuler, 1985), and was then retained as a measurement tool. In developing the ERT, an early decision was made against using the clinical method. This was done for two main reasons. The investigators wanted to be as objective as possible and allow the subjects maximum spontaneity in their responses. Secondly, they wanted the instrument to be usable by practitioners with limited time, skills and financial resources (Tamashiro, 1976).

The ERT is a group administrable test with three parts: a memory scan, a description of a significant event and questions about that event. Subjects usually respond in writing but may also respond orally. During the memory scan, subjects are guided by the examiner in recalling significant events from different periods of their lives. This step is taken to give them a bank of accessible memories to choose from and to get them thinking about themselves. This sort of priming technique is also used by Kegan (1985).

During the recall portion of the instrument, subjects are asked to select a single event to recall in detail. The only criterion for selection is that the experience be one that is "...somehow important to you." (Tamashiro, 1976). They are then guided by the examiner in

recalling the experience in as much detail as possible (the entire text of both the ERT and the ERT2 can be found in an appendix to this article.) The subjects are then asked to respond in writing (or on tape) to six questions about the experience they recalled. The first question simply asks for a detailed written description of the event. Subsequent questions ask the subject to consider how and why the experience was important, and what they know about themselves as a result of the experience. Because the goal was to analyze subjects' spontaneous responses, these questions are deliberately open-ended; there is no mention of patterns or of changing them. Significant numbers of subjects, however, respond to these questions with descriptions of patterns and internal change strategies (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1975).

The scoring guidelines for the ERT are based on descriptions of self-knowledge stages (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein and Alschuler, 1985.) Codable units are defined as any sentence or independent clause containing an "I" referent. Each unit is assigned one of four scores, representing the four stages. A profile score is derived by reporting the frequency with which each stage is found, and an overall score to those frequencies. Thus the researcher is given a picture of the relative frequency with which different stages are used by each subject, and an idea of each subject's most common stage.

The ERT seems to be a useful instrument for analyzing spontaneous self-knowledge responses. Studies have shown acceptable levels of intercoder reliability (Alschuler, Evans, Tamashiro and Weinstein, 1976; Tamashiro, 1976). However, neither the instrument nor its scoring system is effective in assessing the subject's capacity for self-knowledge, the highest stage of reasoning of which s/he is capable. While the scoring system could easily be changed (and Ziff [1979] has proposed such an alternative), it is only part of the problem.

Other measures of self-knowledge have been developed over the years. The Mirroring Questionnaire (MQ) was developed by Ziff (1979, 1980), as part of a study on the effects of matching processing questions in a human relations exercise to the self-knowledge levels of participants. It consists of a structured exercise and a set of questions probing subjects' responses to that exercise. Although the MQ contained several features that were useful in developing the ERT2, it was designed for a relatively narrow research purpose and does not lend itself to broad application. The Modified Experience Recall Test (MERT) was developed by Schiller (1983), as part of a study on the effects of a semester course called "Education of the Self." Again, it contained several features useful in developing the ERT2. The specific contributions of each of these instruments will be discussed as the ERT2 is described.

### The ERT2

The ERT2 was developed and refined over a two-year period. As stated earlier, its principal aim is to stimulate and measure the highest stage of self-knowledge of which each subject is capable. The clinical method would probably be the most effective approach to this goal but, for reasons already stated, the authors decided to retain the group administrable format of the ERT. Like the ERT, the ERT2 has three parts: memory scan, experience recall and questions about the experience.

One important change made was in the criteria given subjects for selecting experiences in both the memory scan and the recall. Subjects were instructed to scan their memories for "times when you had to deal with a problem or conflict; experiences that might have been uncomfortable, but that were and are important to you." This change was first made, in somewhat different form, in the MERT (Schiller, 1983). It was put into the ERT2 for several reasons. An uncomfortable experience, one that the subject wishes had turned out differently, should stimulate higher stages of self-knowledge reasoning than a pleasant experience. The highest stage of self-knowledge development, transformational, is marked by the ability to make internal changes in internal patterns. The desire to make such a change is less likely to emerge when discussing a positive memory. Also, such situations present contradictions between what occurred and what the subject wishes had occurred. The effort to resolve this contradiction, either at the time of the incident or during recall, challenges the subject to make sense of the experience and hence to reason at his/her maximum stage.

An additional change was made as a result of the emphasis on conflict. The ERT used a memory scan that took the subject slowly back through his/her whole lifespan. This is an important step in the assessment process because it gets the subject thinking about him/herself and creates a bank of memories from which the subject can choose. An early version of the ERT2 included a memory scan, but restricted subjects to the incidents of conflict. However, some subjects reported significant psychological discomfort during the scanning. Because such discomfort might inhibit access to and expression of self-knowledge (one subject was unable to continue the interview), the scan was limited to a few experiences of the subjects' choice. Subjects are then asked to select one experience to think and write about in detail, and are guided by the examiner in recalling it in as much detail as possible.

Several changes were made in the written questions selected for the ERT2. Both Ziff (1979) and Hand (1981) have pointed out that a situation encouraging spontaneous

responses is less likely to elicit subjects' maximum capacity than one which is deliberately structured. Flavell (1972) argues that, when testing a developmental sequence, subjects must be given the explicit opportunity to display reasoning from each stage or level. Applying this principle to the measure of self-knowledge, it is not enough to give subjects the opportunity to talk about themselves and then see whether they mention patterns, for example. Subjects must be given the explicit opportunity to display the key features of each stage: feelings, cause-and-effect, patterns, etc.

There are drawbacks to a structured approach as well, especially if it is used exclusively. The MQ used such an approach (Ziff, 1979), even asking the subjects to list their thoughts, feelings and actions separately when recounting the incident. The authors thought that such compartmentalization might actually interfere with self-reflection. Therefore, the ERT2 contains questions that invite the subject to display each stage of SKT, but also allow for unbroken recounting of the experience.

The written questions are worded and sequenced to give subjects the maximum opportunity to display their highest stage of self-knowledge. The first question is a long one:

"Describe as fully as you can and in as much detail as possible the experience you remembered. Please include:

- What you did and what others did
- What you were thinking and feeling in the situation
- What specific conditions or events made you respond as you did
- What led up to this experience
- What the results of the experience were."

This question allows for unbroken recall and also explicitly asks for characteristics of the elemental and situational stages. The next three questions ask the subject to consider the experience as a whole, thus testing for another characteristic of situational reasoning:

"How was this experience important or special to you then?"

"How is this experience important or special to you now?"

"From the experience you just remembered, please describe some things you know about yourself now."

These questions also get the subject thinking about the importance of the experience in terms of their knowledge of themselves, a natural bridge to the next stage (pattern).

The next two questions ask for descriptions of patterns, with the second asking them to consider what they dislike about their pattern:

"In what ways were your thoughts, feelings or actions in this situation typical or atypical of thoughts, feelings or actions you had in other

situations? Is there a 'pattern' to your responses in these situations?  
If so, please describe it in terms of your thoughts, feelings and actions."

"What do you like and/or dislike about the ways you think, feel and act  
in such situations?"

This last question is another bridging question, leading to the transformational stage. The last two questions address this final stage, asking about strategies for changing patterns:

"Describe anything you have tried to do to modify your thoughts or  
feelings in order to change your way of responding in these situations.  
Please explain how your strategy affected your response."

"Do you have any ideas about ways you might try to modify any of your  
thoughts or feelings in order to change your way of responding?"

Subjects are given an unlimited amount of time to answer the questions. The MERT used strict time limits for each question, in the interest of standardization. This was changed in the ERT2 because the authors believed it might inhibit full and elaborate recollection and cause the subject to omit statements that might satisfy stage requirements.

The scoring system for the ERT2 is designed to find the highest stage of reasoning displayed. Using a procedure developed by Ziff (1979), subjects are scored at the highest stage for which one clear example is found. Pure stage scores are possible (E, S, P, T) as well as transitional scores (S/P, etc.) A scoring manual has been developed and is available from either author.

### Reliability

The ERT2 and the coding manual need further study to establish reliability: that is part of the reason for this paper. Some work has been done in this area, however. As part of a study of a pattern stage of SKT (Sweitzer, 1985) the authors, who were in the process of constructing the scoring manual, trained a novice coder during three training and practice sessions. All three coders then coded a set of twenty ERT2 protocols. The results are presented in table one. The relationship between pairs of ratings is expressed in percentages. Perfect agreement between coders ranged from 62 to 71 percent and agreement within one-half stage ranged from 86 to 95 percent.

As part of a graduate seminar in self-knowledge, nine graduate students were given the coding manual to read. All had some familiarity with the theory. They then scored a set of three ERT2 protocols. The results are given in table two. Perfect agreement between coders ranged from 33 to 56 percent and agreement within one half stage ranged from 67 to 100 percent. Agreement of novice coders with expert coders (the two authors) is also presented

in this table and the scores were in the same range.

Table One

|          | 1* and 2 | 2 and 3 | 1 and 3 |
|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| Perfect  | 62       | 48      | 71      |
| W/in 1/2 | 95       | 86      | 95      |

|                       | Table Two |    |     |
|-----------------------|-----------|----|-----|
| Protocols             | 1         | 2  | 3   |
| Perfect Intercoder*   | 44        | 33 | 56  |
| W/in 1/2 Intercoder*  | 67        | 67 | 100 |
| Perfect With Expert*  | 44        | 33 | 56  |
| W/in 1/2 With Expert* | 67        | 33 | 56  |

\*percentages are an average of all nine coders

### Conclusion

The ERT2 is an instrument available to practitioners and researchers wishing to assess subject's maximum level of self-knowledge. The instrument and coding manual await further studies on reliability. There are other prospects for further research. The authors are assuming that the ERT2 will produce scores that are at least the same, if not higher than, ERT scores for any given individual. This assumption could be tested. Finally, those interested in assessment of self-knowledge might undertake development of a clinical method for assessing self-knowledge stages. Such technique would complete the repertoire of measurement instruments available.

## REFERENCES

- Alschuler, A., Evans, J., Tamashiro, R., & Weinstein, G. Self-knowledge education project: Final report. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts 1975.
- Alschuler, A., Evans, J., Tamashiro, R., & Weinstein, G. Self-knowledge development: A measurement manual. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts 1977.
- Brainerd, C. Piaget's theory of intelligence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1978 (a).
- Bringuier, J. Conversations With Jean Piaget. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Broughton, J. Development of concepts of self, mind, reality and knowledge. In W. Damon (Ed.) Social Cognition New Directions for Child Development, no. 1. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1978.
- Colby, A., Gibbs, J., & Widaman, J. Construction and validation of a simplified, group administrable equivalent to the moral judgment interview. Child Development, 1982, **53**, 895-910.
- Flavell, J. The Developmental psychology of Jean Piaget. Princeton, N.J.: Van Norstrand, 1963.
- Flavell, J. An Analysis of cognitive-developmental sequences. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1972, **86**, 279-350.
- Gibbs, J. & Widaman, K. Social intelligence: Measuring the development of sociomoral reflection. Englewood, N.J.: Van Norstrand, 1963.
- Hand, J. The relation between developmental level and spontaneous behavior: The importance of sampling contexts. In K. Fisher (ed.) Cognitive Development. New Direction for Child Development no. 12. San Francisco, Jossey Bass, 1981.
- Kegan, R. The evolving self: problem and process in human development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Kegan, R. Administering the subject-object interview. Unpublished paper, Clinical-Developmental Institute, Belmont Mass., 1985.
- Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: The cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Collins (Ed.), The handbook of socialization theory and research. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1969.
- Kohlberg, L. Moral stage and moralization: The cognitive developmental approach. In T. Likona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

- Kohlberg, L. The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the concept of justice. San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1981.
- Piaget, J. Six Psychological Studies. New York, Random House, 1968.
- Piaget, J. Biology and knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Reimer, J. Developing an interpersonal self (Essay Review.) Harvard Educational Review, 1982, **52**, 214-220.
- Rest, J. Longitudinal study of the Defining Issues Test of moral judgment: A strategy for analyzing developmental change. Developmental Psychology, 1975, **11**, 738-748.
- Schiller, H. Developmental stage matching in psychological education: Relationship between participant self-knowledge level and success in Education of the Self. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1983.
- Selman, R. & Jaquette, D. The development of interpersonal awareness: A working draft. Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project, Cambridge, Mass., 1977.
- Selman, R. The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analyses. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Sweitzer, F. An analysis and comparison of five structural developmental theories. Unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts 1984.
- Sweitzer, F. Towards a reconsideration and refinement of the pattern stage of self-knowledge development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1984.
- Tamashiro, R. Measuring self-knowledge development: Construction of a preliminary scoring manual. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1976.
- Weinstein, G., & Alschuler, A. Education and counseling for self-knowledge development. Journal of Counseling and Development. 1985, **64**, 19-25.
- Ziff, J. Psychological education and developmental theory: differential processing of a human relations training exercise based on self-knowledge stage theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1979.
- Ziff, J. Establishing guidelines for differential processing of structured experiences based on self-knowledge stage theory. Group and Organizational Studies, 1980, **5**, 234-246.

## Appendices

### A. The Experience Recall Test

#### Instruction for Administration of the Experience Recall Test

The following instructions are to be read aloud to an individual or in a group setting. The numbers in brackets indicate the number of seconds the reader should wait before reading the next sentence. The written answer sheets should be handed out before the instructions are given.

#### Instructions

We are involved in a project which is trying to find out how different people know about themselves. There are two parts to this exercise. First, I will have you close your eyes and help you remember an important experience in your life. Then, I'll ask you to open your eyes and answer some questions. The questions you have in front of you are the only ones we want you to answer. Read them over so you'll know what they are, and so you understand them. Your answers will be kept in strict confidence; no one except the project staff will see your responses with your birthdate on it. Are there any questions before we begin?

For the first part of this exercise, it is best if you get in a comfortable and relaxed position in your seat. Go ahead and get as comfortable as you can. Okay? Close your eyes, take a few deep breaths, and relax.

I am going to ask you to think back and remember your life and your experiences. I'll ask you to remember what you did and remember the things that happened to you. As I ask you to think about different times in your life, sometimes you will remember things while other times you might not. Don't worry if you can't think of anything; just relax and wait for the next instruction.

(2)

First, see if you can remember anything important about yourself yesterday (12), last month (10), last year (10), three years ago (10), when you were of high school age (10), when you were of junior high school age (10), when you were of elementary school age (10), when you were a young child (10.)

I want you to find an experience or an event in your life that stands out in your mind, an experience that is somehow important to you. It might be something you will always remember, something you won't ever forget (10.) There might be several of these experiences you can think of, but pick one that you'd like to think about some more (20.)

Now, I want you to remember that experience as much as you can. First, picture the place where you were. What did it look like, and who was there (10). Can you picture what you looked like (10)? Now, see if you can remember exactly what happened. What did you do and say (10)? What did other people do and say (10)? See if you can remember any of your thoughts, or what you were saying to yourself (10)? What were you feeling then (10)? What do you imagine other people were feeling and thinking (10)? Think a little bit about what lead up to this experience (10). And what happened as a result of this experience (10).

Go ahead and finish the scene/event in your mind. Take your time (3) and when you are ready, at your own pace, come back to this room and open your eyes.

The next part is a written section. Take as much time as you need to answer all of the

questions. If you need more space, you may write on the backs of the pages.

- A. Describe as fully as you can and in as much detail as possible the experience you remembered. (Please include what lead up to the experience, what your thoughts and feelings were, and what the results of this experience were.)
- B. How was the experience important or special to you then?
- C. How is the experience important or special to you know?
- D. From the experience you just remembered, please describe some things you know about yourself now.
- E. How could knowing this about yourself be useful to you?  
Specifically, how can it help you get what you want or avoid what you don't want?
- F. Do you have any comments about what it was like answering these questions?

## B. The ERT2

INSTRUCTIONS

**Note to test administrator:** As you read these instructions, you will come across numbers in parentheses. These numbers indicate pauses; you should pause for the number of seconds indicated before continuing. You will also come across instruction to you. These will also be in parentheses, but will be underlined.

In a moment you will begin an exercise whose purpose it is to find out how different people know things about themselves. There are two parts to this exercise. First, I will have you close your eyes and write the answers to some questions. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence; no one except the project staff will see your responses with your identifying number on it. Are there any questions before we begin?

For the first part of this exercise, it is best if you get in a comfortable and relaxed position. Go ahead and get as comfortable as you can. (Wait until subjects have settled into position) Okay? Close your eyes, take a few deep breaths, and try to relax (10.)

I am going to ask you to think back and remember some things that happened to you that you consider important. The incidents I would like you to focus on are times when you had to deal with a problem or conflict; experiences that might have been uncomfortable, but that were and are important to you. These incidents could have happened as recently as yesterday, or as far back as you can remember. Take a few moments now and just get a general picture in your mind of a few different incidents (90.)

Now, I would like you to pick one specific incident of a conflict or problem to focus on and write about. I will be asking you to think about it some more, and during the written section you will be answering many questions about it, so make sure it is an incident you are reading to think about in some depth. Go ahead and pick one specific incident (5.)

Now, I want you to remember the incident as much as you can. First, picture the place where you were. What did it look like, and who was there? (2) Can you picture what you looked like? (2) Now, see if you can remember exactly what happened. (5) What did you do and say? (5) What did other people do and say? (5) See if you can remember any of your thoughts, or what you were saying to yourself. (5) What were you feeling then? (5) What do you imagine other people were thinking and feeling? (5) Think a little bit about what led up to this incident, and what happened as a result. (5) Go ahead and finish the scene in your mind. Take your time and when you are ready, at your own pace, open your eyes. (Wait until everyone has opened their eyes before continuing.)

The next part is the written section. Write as quickly as you can. If you need more space, you may write on the backs of the pages.

1. Describe as fully as you can and in as much detail as possible the experience you remembered. Please include:

- What you did and what others did.
- What you were thinking and feeling in this situation.
- Specifically, what conditions or events made you respond as you did?
- What led up to this experience?
- What the results of this experience were.

2. How was this experience important or special to you then?
3. How is this experience important or special to you now?
4. From the experience you just remembered, please describe some things you know about yourself now.
5. In what ways were your thoughts, feelings or actions in this situation typical or atypical of thoughts, feelings or actions you had in other situations? Is there a "pattern" to your responses in these situations? If so, please describe it in terms of your thoughts, feelings and actions.
6. What do you like and/or dislike about the ways you think, feel and act in such situations?
7. Describe anything you have tried to do to modify your thoughts or feelings in order to change your way of responding in these situations. Please explain how your strategy affected your response.
8. Do you have any ideas about ways you might try to modify any of your thoughts or feelings in order to change your way of responding?